

Page 5  
Serial No. 10/764,908  
Response to Final Official Action

**Amendments to the Drawings**

Please amend Figure 7 according to the replacement sheet submitted herewith.

**Remarks**

Applicant respectfully submits that entry of this Response is proper as it makes no amendments to the claims.

The Examiner has noted the absence of the priority document. Accordingly, the priority document is being filed simultaneously herewith.

The Examiner has noted that extraneous numerals 21 and 31 still appear in Figure 1. Accordingly, these numerals have been removed.

The Examiner has noted certain objections regarding the specification. A replacement table is submitted for paragraph 00024, replacing "Surface No. 1" with "Surface No.", and making no other changes thereto. Additionally, the material to be inserted between paragraphs 00022 and 00023 that applicant previously attempted to submit at pages 11 and 12 of the previous response is resubmitted. Applicant presents this material separately as (a) headings and (b) paragraphs pertaining to figure descriptions that are to be inserted between these headings. Applicant has also corrected the error noted by the Examiner by replacing "suing" with "using".

The Examiner has maintained the rejection of independent claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Takahashi, U.S. Patent No. 5,743,846. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider this rejection in view of the below Remarks.

In its Response to the previous Office Action, Applicant pointed out that the Takahashi reference does not anticipate or render obvious the invention recited in claim 1 because Takahashi does not disclose or suggest a system in which all the lens surfaces are spherical. See 07/14/05 Response at 14-15. As Applicant explained therein, this is a central aspect of the invention, which operates to produce the brightest possible image with a relatively simple arrangement of lenses, as is explained in

paragraphs 00012-14 of the application, and Takahashi does not disclose such a system.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has “respectfully disagreed and respectfully invited the applicant to review the art of Takahashi and the rejection.” The Examiner has identified where this reference supposedly describes a lens system where all the optically active surfaces are spherical, but has again only generally referred to Table 7 in columns 49-50 (erroneously referenced as ‘Table 9’ in the Takahashi patent).

Applicant respectfully notes that the disclosure cited by the Examiner does not disclose a lens system where all the surfaces are spherical. This is shown in the figure cited by the Examiner (Fig. 21), which pretty clearly illustrates that some of the lenses are plano-concave. Additionally, in the Table 7 referenced by the Examiner, these surfaces are specifically designated as having infinite radii of curvature—in other words, they are planar. Accordingly, the illustration and information in the figure and table that are cited by the Examiner do not disclose the use of lens surfaces that are all spherical. To the contrary, they specifically teach to use a lens system with surfaces that are *not* spherical. If for some reason the Examiner believes otherwise, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner articulate the specific basis for that conclusion. Otherwise, Applicant requests that the Examiner allow the claims.

Applicant submits that generic claim 1 is allowable, and thus, withdrawn claims 2, 4, 15 and 18-22 are also allowable. It is respectfully submitted that claims 1-9 and 11-22, all of the claims remaining in the application, are in order for allowance, and early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Page 8  
Serial No. 10/764,908  
Response to Final Official Action

Respectfully submitted,



December 1, 2005

---

Wesley W. Whitmyer, Jr., Registration No. 33,558  
David W. Aldrich, Registration No. 51,159  
Attorney for Applicants  
ST.ONGE STEWARD JOHNSTON & REENS LLC  
986 Bedford Street  
Stamford, CT 06905-5619  
203 324-6155